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correlations and scatter diagrams. All other data is displayed in percentage form.

(2) Sophisticated methodologies for analyzing elections scarcely appear. Very little aggregate analysis (electoral geography) or survey work (attitudinal studies) is reported. Why? This may be due to weak survey research facilities in the countries (especially Greece). One must wonder why no footnotes appear to any work on American elections that uses Michigan's survey research tradition.

(3) The works lack theoretical rigor. Sani's piece is the only one in either book that systematically proposes and tests arguments. Some authors, however, do show great political insight. Sidney Tarrow offers some very astute conjectures about the interests of the political parties and forces in Italian society that form governing coalitions. Samuel H. Barnes provides insight into the skills of the bargainers and the structural constraints bargainers face when trying to obtain a governing majority in Italy. Although these speculations were certainly interesting, and the predictions cited earlier prescient, none were data-based conclusions.

(4) There is little theoretical perspective in the essays, either. Relevant literature on political development and change, political stability and violence, and electoral politics and conflict is often not mentioned. For example, Roy C. Macridis uses arguments about "modernization" (à la Huntington) to explain political instability in Greece, but also argues that Greece was a dependent state in the international arena. There are no citations to any literature on dependency and no recognition that this literature contains a plausible rival argument to the modernization interpretation of political authoritarianism and political instability.

(5) Little comparative perspective on the major issues is offered. The assumption of the At the Polls series, stated in each volume, is that "the greater their [public policymakers'] understanding of the political consequences of the conduct of elections in other countries, the deeper their insights into the impact of electoral rules and practices at home" (p. ix). In spite of these sentiments, neither work attempts to generalize into the cases; theoretical arguments are not explored in depth in either the Italian or Greek context. Nor does either work attempt to generalize out from the cases; arguments that emerge from the Greek or Italian context are not suggested to have wider applicability. Both books, remarkably, contain only one table with data from more than one country. Readers are left with the promise, made in both introductions, that new books in the series will address problems on a cross-national basis.

One must conclude, therefore, that these volumes are insular. They do not grapple effectively with broad methodological, theoretical, or comparative concerns in the field of electoral analysis. One is a study of Italy, the other of Greece, with little social-science encumbrance. At this they succeed, although true country experts will not find much that is new. Those of us who wish to address in some rigorous and comparative fashion the principal issues that make politics in Italy and Greece so interesting are left dissatisfied. It is up to us to pose arguments rigorously, test them with a carefully specified research design, and then to draw cautious generalizations.

MARK LICHBACH
University of Illinois at Chicago


A milestone in the European integrative process was reached in June 1979 when 112 million voters went to the polls across the European Community and elected 410 (24 Greek members were added subsequently) representatives to the European Parliament. The election did not generate the same level of interest for the European publics as it did for political scientists, and voter turnout varied from state to state. These 434 representatives have formed six major transnational party groups in the Parliament.

Prior to 1979, the representatives were chosen by, from, and were responsible to, their respective national parliaments. The new Parliament, directly responsible to the EC's population and voter constituencies, possesses a political legitimacy that the former appointed Parliament never had. This does not by itself give the Parliament any more real effective power vis-à-vis the Commission and the Council of Ministers (its real power is quite low—most of its decisions are only statements of intent without any force in Community law), but it at least strengthens the Parliament's potential to have more influence at the European level in the future.

Geoffrey and Pippa Pridham trace European transnational party cooperation along three separate but related levels: the groups within Parliament, the various European party federations, and the linkage between these two and the national party organizations in the member states. Although rich in narrative detail about the European party federations and the national organizations, the analysis of the behavior of the transnational groups in Parliament—a central focus of
the book—is weak in comparison. A shared ideology is no guarantee of transnational cooperation, and it should not be employed as a surrogate measure of such. A roll-call analysis would have gone a long way in identifying how these groups actually behave and could have specified the actual degree of cohesiveness exhibited by these groups.

The transnational political groups in the Parliament attempt to work out common positions on major issues, but the degree of internal cohesiveness does not reach significant levels. It is obvious that representatives frequently vote counter to their group’s majority view. The very fact of direct elections may have contributed to this comparative independence of the individual member who, no longer responsible to the party hierarchy in the home parliament, has much more leeway when now responsible to an amorphous electorate.

But it is not very realistic to expect a very high degree of cohesiveness or bloc-like behavior from members of a political group who have been elected not as a member of a European political party, but rather as a member of one of some fifty-five separate national parties. The political groups are not yet transnational political parties but rather only broad coalitions/alliances composed of different national parties.

The transnational political groups in the European Parliament may develop into transnational parties, but in order to do so, they will first have to present EP candidates across the ten member states under a single label with a common platform. At present, there are three parties linked at the European level: the Socialists, European Peoples party, and the Liberals. These federations attempted to coordinate the 1979 campaign, and they attempt to maintain links between the EP groups and the national political parties. However, these federations still cannot be called transnational political parties.

The transnational party groups within the European Parliament can serve as new political forces in Europe if and when the Parliament enlarges its power vis-à-vis the Commission and the Council of Ministers. This enlargement does not appear to be imminent, but as the Pridhams demonstrate, the groundwork has been laid.

**Leon Hurwitz**

*Cleveland State University*


Directed to the non-specialist, this slim volume on the theme of Mexico-United States relations might not raise an academic eyebrow but for the exemplary array of specialists represented within its pages, the diversity of topics examined, and the dire need for an updated, comprehensive, and scholarly survey of the range of issues on the bilateral agenda. Ably edited by Susan Kaufman Purcell, these 21 essays embrace a wide range of issues.

Given the topical focus, the editor sagely avoids squeezing the varied and occasionally conflicting perspectives expressed in these essays into a point of view or integrating framework. Little commentary is provided, and little, in truth, is needed. Both Mexican and U.S. scholars’ views are represented adequately throughout the volume, with useful juxtaposition of analysis on the key subjects of trade, foreign investment, migration, and energy.

Nearly one-half of the essays cluster around the hub of vital economic concerns, providing multifaceted analyses of basic economic structures, comparative advantages, and national interests. Most of these share an emphasis on the present and future consequences of economic asymmetry and interdependence for the bilateral relationship.

Supplementing this corpus of essays is a well-considered range of articles canvassing contemporary Mexican social and political conditions and analyzing selected issues less frequently treated in discussions of bilateral affairs. In the latter category are essays focusing on bureaucratic politics and policy, extragovernmental relations, and natural resource conflicts arising from a shared international boundary. Richard E. Feinberg’s piece modeling U.S. policy strategies in relation to organizational arenas and bargaining tactics will be of theoretical interest to analysts of U.S.-Mexican relations.

While this volume is by any yardstick the most comprehensive and up-to-date compendium of essays on the topic of U.S.-Mexican relations, it falls short of covering some issues that might prove useful in an introductory discussion of issues and suffers from several deficiencies that may annoy some readers. Mention is made, for instance, of foreign relations differences over Central America, but no single essay is dedicated to this important topic. One also looks in vain, except for passing mention, for analysis of the maquiladora program, the role of tourism and border commerce in bilateral trade, technology transfer questions, the vegetable deal, and subna-